

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. II.—No. 32.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1861.

WHOLE NUMBER 84.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above
Harpers' Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

TERMS: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANCTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,

as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-traffic, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life;—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

✂ Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

RESULT OF THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL.

The following is the *Result* of the recent Ex-parthe Council on the Church of the Puritans in this city. We copy it entire, from the *N. Y. Independent* of May 16, 1861. We deem it a document of great importance in the religious history of the churches in this country: one that, in connection with the past and future, will be invaluable to the historian, and go far towards fixing the character and condition of the churches, particularly those of the Congregational order, in this country, in respect to the great question of the age. The *Result*, it will be seen, emphatically states that the difficulties of which it treats, "involve no issue between slavery and anti-slavery"—a pretense which we hope to subject to a thorough scrutiny, before we have done with it, and its authors.

THE COUNCIL CALLED BY AGGRIEVED MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS.

Seventy-six members of the Church of the Puritans in this city—feeling aggrieved by repeated acts of the majority of the church, requested the church to unite with them in calling a Mutual Council for advice. Though the applicants constitute nearly one-third of the resident members of the church, this request was refused in the most peremptory manner, and six of the applicants were summarily suspended from all rights and privileges in that church. The aggrieved persons then called an *ex-parthe* council to consider their case. In the *interim*, however, six of the original number withdrew, and united with another church, leaving seventy complainants in all.

The Council met on Tuesday May 2d, at the Hall of the Geographical Society, in this city. The following pastors and delegates were present:

From the First Congregational Church, Concord, N. H.—Rev. N. Bouton, D. D., Bro. Jonathan Kittredge.

From the Park street church, Boston, Mass.—Rev. A. L. Stone, Rev. Giles Pease.

From the Broadway Congregational Church, Norwich, Ct.—Rev. John P. Gulliver, Bro. Theodore McCurdy.

From the North church, New Haven, Ct.—Rev. S. W. S. Dutton, D. D., Deacon N. Jocelyn.

From the Second Congregational church, Greenwich, Ct.—Rev. J. H. Linsley, D. D., Rev. Mark Mead.

From the Congregational church, Albany, N. Y.—Rev. Ray Palmer, D. D., Deacon A. S. Kibbe.

From the Congregational church, Canandaigua, N. Y.—Deacon Henry W. Taylor.

From the Plymouth church, Syracuse, N. Y.—Rev. M. E. Strieby, Bro. Ira H. Cobb.

From the Congregational church, Newark, N. J.—Rev. W. B. Brown, Rev. Geo. Brown.

From the First Congregational church, Jacksonville, Ill.—Rev. J. M. Sturtevant, D. D.

From the New-England church, Chicago, Ill.—Rev. Samuel Wolcott.

From the Broadway Tabernacle church in New York city—Rev. J. P. Thompson D. D., Deacon Austin Abbott.

From the Clinton Avenue church, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Rev. William I. Buddington, D. D., Bro. Wm. P. Libbey.

From the Bedford Congregational church, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Rev. H. B. Elliott.

From the First Congregational church, Patterson, N. J.—Rev. C. H. A. Bulkley.

From the Central Congregational church, Brooklyn, N. Y.—Rev. J. C. French.

Rev. Dr. Sturtevant was chosen Moderator, Rev. Dr. Dutton, of New Haven, Scribe, and Rev. Mr. Elliott of Brooklyn, Assistant Scribe. The Council continued their sessions, with little intermission, until Tuesday, the 7th inst., at 1 P. M., and then adjourned, having unanimously adopted the following result. Their investigations were thorough, their deliberations protracted and careful, and their conclusion will be read with profound interest. It is as follows:

RESULT OF COUNCIL.

The Ecclesiastical Council, called by seventy-six members of the Church of the Puritans, in the city of New York,* to consider certain alleged grievances suffered by them at the hands of the majority of that church; also to determine whether that church has not, by its general policy, so completely and persistently violated the fundamental principles of Congregational order, as to have forfeited its claim to the fellowship of our churches; and also to advise the aggrieved members, concerning the expediency of their being constituted and recognized as a church of Christ,—after a full, deliberate, and prayerful examination of the subject-matter submitted to them, *unanimously* came to the following

RESULT.

The Council, upon assembling, found evidence that the aggrieved members had not resorted to an *ex-parthe* Council, until, according to Congregational usage, they had sought the assent of the church to the calling of a Mutual Council,—which request had been denied. Thereupon the council appointed a committee to communicate with the Church of the Puritans, through its officers, and invite it to accept this council as a Mutual Council, and if this invitation should be declined, to meet the council through a committee, and furnish such information as might be wanted. They were also requested to allow us the use of the church records. The officers of the church, after consultation, notified us that they had no authority to act in the premises, and neither appeared, nor furnished the records.

The question of the expediency of dissolving the pastoral relation, subsisting between the Rev. George B. Cheever D. D., and the Church of the Puritans, was intended to be submitted to a Mutual Council, as proposed to the church by the complainants, and therefore that question was stated in the specifications laid before this council: but the council declined to entertain that question at all, and also requested the complainants to confine their statements to the character and doings of the church, and to avoid, as far as possible, all reference to the character and doings of the pastor, now absent and unable to answer for himself.

It appeared from the investigations which followed, that the most important points in the case, rest upon documentary evidence, and upon public and undisputed acts of the church and its officers. The council, therefore, find themselves relieved, in a great degree, from the embarrassment which would have been caused by a strictly *ex-parthe* examination, and are able to base their result, in great part, upon the evidence of documents proceeding from the party which declines to appear in the case.

We find the following facts fully proved:

1. That an attempt was commenced in February, 1859, by a few members of the church, to obtain a large fund, in Great Britain, to meet the current expenses of the church or, as an alternative, to establish another church.

2. That this movement was unauthorized by the church or society, and unknown to them until the November following.

3. That the pecuniary ability of the Society at that period, was fully adequate to meet its own expenses, as appears from the fact that, although the annual expenses are less than seven thousand dollars, during the first four months of the year 1859, between seven and eight thousand dollars were raised by the congregation for the removal of the floating debt, and for various other purposes, in addition to the ordinary expenses.

4. That in May, 1859, at the very time that the appeal for aid in Great Britain was in progress, the Society, by the above special subscription, was freed from debt.

*Six of the number who united in the letter missive, having received letters of dismission from the Church of the Puritans, have united with the church to which they were recommended, leaving but seventy who await the action of this council; and, in speaking of the complainants in the case, we refer exclusively to these seventy.

5. That the funds obtained were to be placed in the hands of the pastor of the church, and of a committee to be selected by him—their successors to be chosen by themselves, without any responsibility to the Church or Society.

6. That the object of this arrangement, in the words of its authors, was "to sustain the ministry of Dr. Cheever in this edifice, if possible; if not, in some other," and that they declined to place the funds under the control of the Church, in consequence of "some doubts as to the permanence of our majority," and also because they were aware that "a large and influential minority, from the nature of the case, would bitterly oppose the measure."

7. That notwithstanding this avowed design to create a money power, independent of the church, and possibly hostile to it, the British aid mission was planned and prosecuted in the name and behalf of the church, the credentials of Miss Johnstone containing the following language:

"Miss J. visits Great Britain on a mission connected with the interests of *this Church*." "Miss J. has undertaken to visit Great Britain for the purpose of procuring funds for the benefit of *the Church of the Puritans in this city*."

8. That Miss Elizabeth Johnstone who was employed to prosecute the British aid mission, was suffered to enter upon it with but a partial knowledge of its plan and objects, and with wrong impressions concerning the pecuniary ability of the church, and thus was allowed unwittingly to make representations concerning it, not in accordance with truth, and to place herself in a false position, both at home and abroad.

9. That while this concealment was practiced toward the British public, a similar concealment was practiced towards the parties in interest at home; Miss Johnstone being instructed to keep her proceedings as private as possible, "on account of the clamor which would be raised by our enemies,"—both donors and ostensible beneficiaries being thus blinded as to these important proceedings, the facts becoming known at last, only through the publication of a private letter in a daily newspaper.

10. That all these proceedings concerning the British mission, were fully indorsed and justified by the church, by formal vote, in November, 1859; though by a very small majority.

11. That the church have allowed tests to be used in admitting members, other than those affecting the christian character of the applicants, with the avowed purpose of constituting, not a simple church of Christ, but an organization which should sustain certain men and measures.

12. That the church has allowed its officers, members and committees, to represent that all who, for any cause, objected to the course of the majority, were prompted by pro-slavery sentiments, though this was repeatedly and constantly denied by them, and contradicted by their antecedents and present position on that subject.

13. That the church, in its public meetings, and in the reports of its committees, allowed the minority to be stigmatized as "schismatics, covenant-breakers," and "conspirators," simply because they opposed the course of the majority, although they had never proposed to disregard its decision, in any manner which can be properly characterized as schismatic.

14. That the church regarded and treated an expression of dissent from the policy of the pastor, as only a factious, selfish, and unscrupulous opposition should be regarded and treated.

15. That the church have repeatedly disregarded their own standing rules, in their treatment of the aggrieved parties, and openly justified this course upon the plea that it was necessary in self-defence.

16. That the church received Mr. T. J. Hall, in an irregular manner, without allowing a presentation of objections to his admission, and while a serious difficulty remained unsettled between himself and members of the church.

17. That charges having been presented to the church against Mr. Charles Abernethy, in their superficial aspect, seriously affecting his christian character and standing, but in their substance groundless, and evidently so deemed by the Prudential Committee, and the truth of which, he immediately and peremptorily denied, repeatedly demanding a trial thereupon, the church postponed the trial for nearly six months, leaving him under the public reproach of the accusation, without opportunity of defence, and have to this day, neither granted him the trial, nor withdrawn the charges.

18. That the request made for a mutual council by seventy six members of the church, was refused by the church in circumstances peculiarly demanding, according to the usages of our churches, the calling of such a council.

19. That immediately upon the refusal of the application for a mutual council, six of the applicants, viz: E. W. Chester, Charles Abernethy, O. R. Harvey, George H. White, Thomas Rigney, and Joel Blackmer, were "suspended from all the rights and privileges of membership in the church, until the church take other action in the premises," without the offering of any charges or complaint, without any notice of trial, and without any fair opportunity for defence or protest.

20. That the church in its public documents, and in the general style of remarks in its meetings, has characterized its sister churches and their pastors, who did not approve the special measures and peculiar speech of its pastor, as friendly to slavery, or unfaithful in bearing testimony against it.

In this statement, the council have aimed to give the prominent facts in the case, in their simplest form. The testimony concerning the circumstances accompanying these transactions, and the spirit and measures of the dominant party in the church, unfolded to the council a history, the parallel of which can scarcely be found in all the annals of our churches. Words cannot adequately express the shame we have felt, that a church calling itself by the name of the revered Puritans, and identified in the eyes of the public with the Congregational faith and order, and claiming to be the especial champion of human rights, should have exhibited in this high place of the national metropolis, such scenes of disorder, such disregard of the sacred rights of the household of faith, and such wanton violation of the laws which Christ has laid down for the government of his churches. We find consolation in the assurance that He who maketh the wrath of man to praise Him, will make this sad example the means of strengthening the conviction throughout our churches, already so deeply rooted in the minds of the true sons of the Pilgrims, that the order of Christ's house can only be observed by a strict and conscientious observance of all the laws for the intercourse of the christian brotherhood, which Christ has ordained.

Having now ascertained the facts in the case, as presented in the testimony and documents, with the exception of those relating personally to the pastor, the council proceeds to consider the questions propounded to them by the complainants.

These are mainly two. The first has reference to the course which should be adopted by the churches of the Congregational order toward the Church of the Puritans. The second, to the course which should be taken by the aggrieved brethren, concerning their future church relations.

The first of these questions is propounded to the council in the following words:

"Whether, in view of all the facts and considerations to be brought to their notice in the examination of these complaints, the interests of the Christian church, do not require that the fellowship of the churches be withdrawn from the Church of the Puritans, and it be declared no longer in connection with the Congregational body."

It will be well understood by all Congregationalists, that the only action which the council can take concerning the withdrawal of fellowship here mentioned, is of an advisory character. We can give our opinions and the reasons for them. But it will remain for each church to determine for itself, in view of all the facts, whether or not it will adopt our opinions or follow our advice.

The council of course, does not assume to act for "the Congregational body."

We see but one course left for our churches. We must withdraw from this church which has virtually withdrawn from us. We must not allow ourselves to be held responsible any longer for the conduct of a church which rejects our principles, spurns our advice, and refuses to redress the grievances of brethren whom we honor and love.

We, therefore, recommend to the churches of the Congregational order that, in such way as shall be accordant with the principles of our platforms and usages, they withdraw from the Church of the Puritans the fellowship of the churches, until it shall recede from its present position, and give evidence of a return to the spirit of Christ, and to the order of the Congregational churches.

In respect to the aggrieved members, the council do, notwithstanding the action of the Church of the Puritans, recognize them as worthy members of the body of Christ; and recommend that, with others who may associate with them, they either be constituted in due form a distinct church or received into sister churches, as they shall prefer. And the scribe of this council is hereby authorized to give certificates of good standing to such of them as shall apply to him for the same previous to December 1, 1861.

In conclusion, the council would distinctly and emphatically state that the difficulties and grievances which have passed under their review, have involved no issue between slavery and anti-slavery, but have arisen solely from the violation, by the majority of the church, of the fundamental principles of church order, and of the most sacred rights of individual members. The council feel, therefore, that in this result they are vindicating not only Congregationalism, but the cause of anti-slavery, from the reproach brought upon it, by the proceedings of the Church of the Puritans. They also express their approbation of the christian patience and forbearance with which the aggrieved brethren have endured manifold wrongs, and the fidelity with which they have maintained the

principles of church order and of christian duty committed to their trust; and affectionately and earnestly exhort them to continue in the future, as they have been in the past, faithful to the kingdom of Christ, and also to the interests of Congregationalism and the cause of anti-slavery, notwithstanding the grievances to which they have been subjected in the name of both. Should they decide to organize themselves into a distinct church, we counsel them to profit by this experience, and to make it a church which shall not only defend the rights of the enslaved, but also the rights of its members; which shall not only vindicate the principle of the essential independency of every individual church, but shall also recognize the other great principle of Congregationalism—the duty of every church to advise with its sister churches in all matters of common interest, and to give a due respect to their counsels and opinions.

With this exposition of the conclusions to which we have been brought, we leave this painful matter to the revival of our christian brethren, and to the disposal of the Great Head of the church.

[We have ourselves prepared a Review of the Result of the Ex-parte Council, in connection with some of its antecedents, which we reserve for future publication, giving place, now, to the very appropriate Reply of the Church itself.]

From the N. Y. Daily Tribune of June, 10, 1861.

THE CHURCH OF THE PURITANS IN REPLY TO THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL.

The publication, with elaborate comment, of the proceedings of the recent Ex-Parte Council on the Church of the Puritans, in *The New-York Independent* of May 16, affords the church a fitting opportunity to make its public statement and vindication.

From the time that the notable *seventeen*, assuming to be a majority of the church, according to the standard of wealth, position, and influence, presented their memorable letter to the pastor, inviting him to resign, until the present the main principle of church policy which we have applied, and for which we have contended, has been nothing more odious, offensive, or startling than the principle of the right of the majority to rule. Our church recognizes no qualification of voters, either of property or position, and this majority has, therefore, been of the number of our regular members. By this majority, we have elected to continue our pastor, and have adopted all our measures. A minority party, dissatisfied with our choice of pastor and measures, after a protracted dissent and opposition, applied to the church for a consent to an arbitration of difference, before a council mutually called. The church, seeing no propriety in arbitrating before another, what had already been decided before its own tribunal, declined the application.

The minority party then called a council of their own, *ex-parte*, put in their own testimony, made their own statements, argued their own case, and got their decision. An effort having been made to palm off this *ex-parte* council as a tribunal, and to give to its decision the force and validity of a verdict fairly obtained, this matter should be the subject of particular scrutiny. It is not a little singular and extraordinary that a considerable number of ministers and laymen professing the principles of the Congregational Puritans can be found who are willing to respond to the call of a dissentient minority in a body the very first and central principle of whose constitution it is that it shall be ruled and controlled by a majority of the members constituting it, and to meet in council with that minority, *ex-parte*, taking their *ex-parte* statement as to the alleged offences of the church, hearing their arguments, and after consulting over the matter in secret conclave, announcing their "advisory" verdict that the church should be excommunicated from the fellowship of other churches of its denomination. It is the more singular and surprising inasmuch as it was charged before the Council as a grave offense against the church that it had on one occasion suspended from the rights and privileges of membership, until further action by the church, six of its own members, without the form and routine of stated church trial. It was not charged that the six members were not present at the suspension, or that they were not heard in their own behalf. Yet, before this *ex-parte* Council, by which the church was excommunicated the church was in nowise represented, neither did the church recognize or notice the Council in any way, either by sending a Committee to attend their deliberations, by furnishing for their use the church records or documents, or any scrap of evidence of any kind whatsoever.

It cannot be argued that the church was in fault in refusing to make the Council mutual, and should not complain at the result of it *ex-parte*. The church, for reasons satisfactory to itself, and with the prerogative of an independent body, declined having any council whatever. Must Congregational churches accept mutual councils when called for by a dissentient minority under pain of being visited with the blundering deliberations and sham decision of an *ex-parte* council? If so, then an *ex-parte* council may be properly defined as the penalty incident to a refusal of a mutual one. On this principle, any member disliking the action of his church may propose a mutual council; if the church decline he may call one *ex-parte*, make his own

statement, and secure and publish a decision in his own favor. Such a proceeding would be a gross insult and injustice to a church, as well as a dangerous infringement of its independency. No church is truly independent unless it is at liberty to decline an appeal from its own tribunal to another without any pain or penalty whatever. An *ex-parte* council in such a case is simply an arrangement for compelling a church into a surrender of its independency by levying black mail. Now as of all arrangements for extorting from men that which they ought not to yield, black mail is incalculably the meanest, so an *ex-parte* council in the case supposed, ranks among synods, councils, diets, Queen's commissioners, and all other institutions and devices of Satan for defeating or invading that independency and liberty which is Christ's great legacy to His Church, incalculably the most odious and contemptible.

But the Council take care to set forth that this decision is "advisory" merely, and say that they have no authority to decide judicially. To whom is this advice given? A part truly to those who called the Council. Then they advise to organize into a church by themselves, etc. Then they go on to advise all other churches to recognize the new organization as a church, and fellowship them as such. Then they advise all other churches to withdraw fellowship from the Church of the Puritans. Now, what freak of propriety seized the Council at this juncture, and prevented them, after they had gratuitously given their advice to so large a part of Christendom, from advising Dr. Cheever to resign his pastorate, as the minority party suggested, it is difficult to divine. Such advice would have been as substantial and important in the latter case as it was in the former. But is such a decision simply advisory? Is not the term used as a cover for a decision in its main features judicial, such as by their own declaration they have no right to make? Suppose they had given as a part of their decision that Dr. Cheever ought to be imprisoned; would such a decision have been considered as merely advisory? Would it not have been rather in all respects a judicial condemnation of his character? And would the case be changed, had they put their decision in the form of advising the State to imprison him? Advising members to secede from us and from another body, and advising other churches to fellowship them and withhold their fellowship from us, implies the strongest judicial condemnation of our church, such as should never be made without the fullest, most thorough investigation of facts, such as could never be made *ex-parte*. True, they had no authority to execute such a decision; to follow it up by actual excommunication. Yet such a decision, judicial in its kind, not advisory as they pretend, they have made, and that *ex-parte*.

But to bring the matter up more plainly take an illustration: Suppose the recreant South had applied to our National Government, through their Commissioners, to submit all matters of difference to Lord Lyons, or some council mutually chosen or agreed upon, for arbitration, each party, of course, to be bound by the decision. Prominent among the points which they wish to submit appears the following to wit: "Whether in view of the present existing difficulties the best interest of the State do not require that the official relations now existing between this country and the Hon. Abraham Lincoln be dissolved?" No doubts being raised as to the validity of Mr. Lincoln's election, the Government treat the proposition with silent contempt. But the irrepressible minority are not to be thus thwarted. They immediately proceed to call an *ex-parte* international council of their own. They make their own statements and arguments, and offer their own inducements, and lo! the council decides: the Government to be in the wrong, fully sanctions the conduct of the rebellious minority, advises them to secede and from a nation by themselves, advises the nations of the earth to award them national fellowship and recognition and henceforth to withdraw such fellowship and recognition from the United States. Would not such a proceeding be justly treated as a formidable and diabolical conspiracy against the Republic, and a declaration of enmity and war? And would the case be changed by the council's declaring that their decision was merely advisory? The very fact of such a council being convened and of such a decision being made would be taken as conclusive evidence that the members who composed it were inspired by the deepest hostility to the State.

Now, the principle that the majority shall rule is the basis of congregational church polity as it is of republican civil government. Without an observance of this rule no organization can exist. The plea that the minority have the right to dissent and rebel is demoralizing and disorganizing. The principle that the majority shall rule involves the principle that the minority shall submit and acquiesce. As President Lincoln well says in his Inaugural: "If the minority will not acquiesce the majority must, or the Government must cease. There is no alternative for continuing the Government, but acquiescence on the one side or the other. If a minority in such a case will secede rather than acquiesce, they make a precedent which in turn will ruin and divide them; for a minority of their own will secede from them whenever a majority refuses to be controlled by such a minority."

Rebellion and secession in the state is the same in principle as rebellion and secession in the church. The former involves the violation of a most sacred obligation or oath of allegiance to our Government, strikes at the very basis of the national integrity, of the principles on which the Re-

public is founded, and is justly estimated as the highest crime. The latter is in violation of a most sacred covenant assumed before God and man by every member on being admitted to the church, infringes the same principles in Congregational polity, and is an offense of the gravest kind against the law of Christ and the peace and prosperity of his church. And the offense in both cases is more heinous because committed against a form of government and polity the freest and most beneficent known either to church or state. Every one will see striking evidence as to the character and quality of this *ex-parte* Council in reading in their report a decision where, in addressing the minority, they "affectionately and earnestly exhort them to continue in the future, as they have been in the past, faithful to the Kingdom of Christ, and also to the interests of Congregationalism."

Introducing the statement we are about to make as to the course of Dr. Cheever and the church, we cannot avoid quoting from the record, of the discourse preached by the Puritan minister, John Robinson, to the Pilgrims on their final fast day, just previous to their departure for the New-World: "He charged them (says Gov. Winslow), before God and His blessed Angels, to follow him no further than he followed Christ. And if God should reveal anything to them by any other instrument of His, to be as ready to receive it as ever they were to receive any truth by his ministry, for he was very confident the Lord had more truth and light yet to break forth out of His Holy Word. He took occasion also miserably to bewail the state of the Reformed Churches, who were come to a period in their religion, and would go no further than the instrument of their Reformation. As for example, the Lutherans could not be drawn to go beyond what Luther said; for whatever part of God's Word He had further revealed to Calvin, they had rather die than embrace it; and so, said he, you see the Calvinists, they also stick where he left them—a misery much to be lamented. For though they were precious and shining lights in their time, yet God had not revealed His whole will to them: and were they now alive, said he, they would be as ready to embrace further light as that they had received. Here also he put us in mind of our church Covenant, whereby we engaged with God and with one another to receive whatever light or truth should be made known to us from His written word. But withal He charged us to take heed what we receive for truth, and well to examine, compare, and weigh it with other Scriptures before we receive it; for, said he, it is not possible the Christian world should come so lately out of such Anti-Christian darkness, and that full perfection of knowledge should break forth at once." We take this extract for a text or introduction because it is as fresh with truth and wisdom as though it had been written for these very times. The issues in controversy are indeed different, but the conflict in kind is the same.

Dr. Cheever's anti-slavery course commenced in his becoming convinced that the main argument in favor of slavery was founded in a scandalous misinterpretation and gross misapprehension as to the meaning of many parts of the Word of God. In his view, the testimony of the Bible was no more direct and pungent against murder, adultery and theft than against slaveholding; that the relation of master and slave being intrinsically wrong and sinful, nothing but evil and mischief could come of the system of slavery. His argument attacked the inherent criminality and wickedness of the relation of master and slave, and arraigned *slaveholding*, the holding of a man as a slave or chattel and treating and dealing in him as an article of traffic and merchandise, as the fundamental sin—as being that which is held by the law of God to be an immorality of the highest grade, and classed in the same category with murder. That our national complicity with slavery made us, even at the North, parties to the guilt. That this law of God, being the highest and supreme law, all constructions of our Constitution, all laws passed, precedents established, and decisions made, adverse thereto were wrong, and that it was the duty of the nation, as having a conscience void of offense toward God, to abolish slavery and remove the iniquity from among us. These truths he demonstrated, illustrated, and applies in his pulpit, on the platform, and through the press. His course aroused opposition, but the truth got hold more and more upon his conscience, and demanded more and more imperatively at his hands a promulgation. It seemed to be God's will that he should preach, and suffer, for this truth, and his covenant was that of the Puritan fathers, "to do God's will made known, or to be made known to him, whatever it cost." His heart was on fire in the work. He spoke on the subject as no man had ever spoken before. There were dissections—some complaining that he was "always harping," others that he was "too denunciatory," others that his "excessive night vigils robbed him of his accustomed spirits." But like Bunyan's Christian, as for his own salvation he "put his fingers in his ears and ran on." And, like Paul, he shunned not "to declare the whole counsel of God, whether men would hear or forbear."

This course provoked controversy and opposition in a quarter from which he little expected it. Several of his confederates among the Congregational clergy attacked his interpretations of Scripture, and assailed his course as arrogant, presumptuous and uncharitable. These assailants professed to deplore the moral evils arising from the exist-

ence of slavery, and incident to this system, but insisted that slaveholding should never be pronounced *malum in se*; i.e., wrong in and of itself. Their opposition at length grew into an hostility so intense that they no longer concealed their complicity with the minority opposition in the church in favor of Dr. Cheever's removal. Prominent among them were Dr. Bacon of New-Haven, and Dr. Thompson of New-York, both editors of *The New York Independent*.

The fire that burned in Dr. Cheever's own heart soon caught hold, by a blessed contagion, upon the hearts of his church. They believed his testimony and sustained him for the truth's sake. For the same reason they were so persistent in sustaining him, not rallying around him on account of his genius or for his own sake personally, dear though he was to them, but for the sake of the truth that he witnessed. Thus, all thought of surrendering into the hands of a dissenting minority seemed to them like a wicked apostasy in abandoning the truth and forsaking God and his cause.

But upon some the truth had no power. The redoubled zeal, devotion and prayers of the church, presented a marked contrast to their coldness and indifference, and they soon appeared in the ranks of the hostile party; some alleged harshness in Dr. Cheever, or irregularity in the church being put forward as a pretext for their going over; then others ran well for a time, but fell by the way.

The faithful company remaining not being by any means composed of the most wealthy of the once-affluent congregation, the prosecution of our cause and labors necessitated extraordinary financial exertions and measures. Money was solicited and obtained from friends outside the church, both in this country and abroad, and we have never felt the appeal to be either humiliating or improper. It is sadly inconsistent for the *ex-parte* Council to maintain the principle that churches are bound to ask one another for advice and not for money. We hold that a church may consult its own necessities in either case. We needed money, and asked it of British churches, deeming them most likely, in the existing emergency, to favor our cause. Had we needed advice it would probably have been solicited from a similar quarter. Certainly no sensible person could expect us to ask either advice or money from churches, like the *ex-parte* Council, hostile to us and our cause. If one in a good cause should not take counsel of his fears, he may at least be excused for not asking either advice or support from his enemies.

The church has not gone through this conflict without efforts at discipline. During the past year, charges were presented against Mr. Charles Abernethy, a merchant of standing, and one of the leaders of the hostile minority, to the effect that he had slandered the pastor, and been guilty of disorderly and schismatical conduct in the church. All attempts at carrying on the trial were strenuously resisted by Mr. Abernethy and his friends, and, after a session of the church for five evenings in the matter, without getting so far as to examine a single witness, Mr. Abernethy having remarked that it was not improbable that his trial might occupy a couple of years, and that the private character of Dr. Cheever must be brought under review, it was deemed best to adjourn the trial until the time that it was believed Dr. Cheever would return from Europe. And, accordingly, it was so done, the hostile minority only pressing the trial when the motion was made to adjourn it.

The church has not, as the minority party purport to have alleged, and as the *ex-parte* Council seem to have supposed, been disregarding of its rules and by-laws. Constructions and interpretations of the rules and by-laws favorable to some hostile scheme of the minority party have many times been claimed by them and resisted and refuted by the church, and by this means much mischief has been prevented. The case of Thomas J. Hall is an instance. Mr. Hall, at the annual election of the Society held March 12, 1860, was elected a Trustee, together with Messrs. Henry A. Hartt and William E. Whiting. At this election, Deacons George H. White and William H. Smith, two of the applicants for the *ex-parte* Council, acted as Inspectors of Election; and although they admitted and declared at the time that Messrs. Hartt, Hall, and Whiting had a majority of the votes cast, and that they were elected, withheld from them the customary certificate of their election, and nearly two weeks afterward gave the certificate to two of the defeated candidates, Messrs. Harvey and Tompkins. This trick, inasmuch as it afforded the defeated candidates a pretext for attempting to act as Trustees, and inasmuch as it involved the question of the control of the church property, and as to whether Dr. Cheever's enemies should have the power to close his own church against him, caused great confusion, and compelled Messrs. Hartt, Hall, and Whiting to go into the courts for redress. These gentlemen, in their complaint against Deacons White and Smith, the Inspectors, charged them with an intent to defraud and cheat in the matter of the certificate. Soon after the commencement of this suit, Mr. Hall presented his letter from the Broadway Tabernacle Church (where he had hitherto retained his membership, though he had for some time attended the church of the Puritans) and asked to be admitted. Deacons White and Smith were, at that time, members of the Prudential Committee, and strenuously resisted any action upon the letter, except to lay the consideration of it over, saying that they had been wronged by

Mr. Hall, &c., and prevailed upon the Committee to do so. But the church, considering that the Deacons were the persons who had done wrong, took the matter out of the hands of its committee and propounded and elected Mr. Hall at its own session. The hostile minority maintained that the church had no right to go behind the action of its Committee; but we maintained that the church had the right to redress a wrong done by its Committee, inasmuch as it created that Committee. In this we are upheld by our own rules and by the well-known principles of Congregationalism.

Another instance of alleged invasion of the church rules is found in the matter of the tests applied to persons seeking admission to the church as members. Shortly after Dr. Cheever's departure for Europe, a young man, one of the hostile minority, in conversation with a warm friend and supporter of the church and pastor, made strong expression of dissatisfaction and declared it to be his purpose to bring in members from other churches to vote down Dr. Cheever and his friends. This abominable declaration was soon followed up by his presenting the letter of his own wife, from some church in the country, and asking admission. The Prudential Committee, composed of those loyal to the church, felt bound to inquire into the motives of the lady, and as to her feelings toward the pastor. She being quite non-committal, all action upon her letter was postponed. Subsequently it became quite customary to make these inquiries of applicants, and it was deemed, on the whole, a wholesome and necessary precaution against the threatened packing of the church with members hostile to it, for the purpose of voting out the pastor. By this practice we affirm that no rule or law of Congregationalism or Scripture is violated.

In reply to what has been alleged in effect that our conduct toward other churches and ministers has been improper, we reply that we have had a controversy with them touchings things vital to Christianity, as we have above indicated, in the statement of our reasons for sustaining Dr. Cheever. This controversy has begotten in us no feeling of kindness or uncharitableness toward their ministers and churches, but rather one of grief and sorrow at their backwardness and indifference on the great question of Human Freedom.

A point has also been taken at our suspending six members without formal trial. This suspension took place at a meeting called by the hostile minority for the purpose of presenting their petition for a council. This meeting was called while the church was engaged in an effort for peace and reconciliation, by visiting all those members who had been identified with the opposition, and conversing with them, with a view, if possible, to adjust differences. This last effort of a patient and forbearing church to settle all difficulties arising within itself having been thus cut short by the eager haste of a few of the leading dissenters, six of them who had been in our late troubles most prominent were selected, and suspended from the rights and privileges of membership until the church should take further action. Their offense being mainly one of a public character, that of persistent rebellion and schismatical and disorderly conduct, and well known and understood by the church, and there being no provision in our Church Constitution, denoting what shall be done in such a case, it was deemed a case of disability under our church Constitution, and therefore a matter to be dealt with according to a wise discretion. Five of the six suspended were present at the meeting, and the church listened patiently to arguments from three of them. Their suspension was nevertheless carried by a vote of 73 to 13.

In regard to the list of seventy names signed to the call for a council, we remark that a large proportion are the names of persons who long since ceased to participate in our church meetings and labors. Many of them are incapacitated from voting or taking part in our business meetings under our rules, by reason of their absence. Of the grievances charged in the paper which they have subscribed, they could not have been personally cognizant, had the charges been true.

In conclusion, we say, that if by concealment or misrepresentation of fact, indorsed by the *dictum* of the *ex-parte* Council, the public have been led to form an opinion adverse to the church, we are at least entitled to a careful perusal of the above statement and vindication.

Signed on behalf and by the direction of the Church.

| | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| EDWARD GILBERT, | SAM'L R. DAVIS, | } Committee. |
| HENRY A. HARTT, | WM. E. WHITING. | |

Southern Bonds.—The *Boston Transcript* has this paragraph:

Fifty thousand dollars of the bonds of the Southern Confederacy, belonging to parties in New Orleans, who were forced to sell them, were disposed of a fortnight ago, at the rate of ten cents on a dollar. Only five thousand dollars could be obtained in the market, for the entire lot; which, within a few months, cost \$50,000.

A rebel emissary, one Capt. Trappman, sailed from Boston, for Liverpool on Wednesday, orders for his arrest having arrived a little too late.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, JUNE 22, 1861.

LETTERS on business for the *Principia* should be addressed to M. B. WILLIAMS, the Publisher.

LETTERS for the Editor, whether for his consideration, or for the public, should be addressed to WILLIAM GOODELL.

ORDERS for books or pamphlets may be addressed to either of the above.

But in all cases, the business matter should be on a slip of paper separate from suggestions or communications for the Editor—because business papers must be kept on the Publisher's file, by themselves. For the same reason, what is designed for the Publisher should be on one slip of paper, and matter designed for the Editor's attention or use should be on another, though all may be put into one envelope, and directed to either.

All letters for us should be carefully directed to 339 Pearl street, not to 48 Beckman street, nor to Box 1212, (the former address of Wm. Goodell, where some of his letters continue to be sent.) This is the more important now, as the office of our friends, is now removed; and letters directed there will be liable to be lost.

POLITICIANS CONTROL THE WAR!

Great was the gratulation, among many abolitionists, at the breaking out of the present war, because they supposed that the slavery question was taken out of the hands of scheming politicians, and would have to be decided on the military necessities of the country, which would, of course, require the abolition of slavery.

They were mistaken: not in the idea that the necessities of the war require a prompt abolition of slavery; but in the anticipation that the war policy would not be shaped by the same short sighted politicians who have prevented legislative action against slavery. The Chicago Platform, so shaped and expounded as not to offend Democratic and other politicians, controls the Executive and the Cabinet, including the War-Department which controls Gen. Scott, Gen. Butler, Gen. McClellan and Gen. Patterson. And leading politicians, in preference to experienced and scientific military men, are promoted to the high posts in the army.

There must be no interference with slavery, as an "institution," and no liberation of slaves, provided their masters adhere to the Union. Such is now the policy of the administration and of the camp.

The question whether the abolition of slavery be not a military necessity is staved off by the standing creed of the politicians of all parties, that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to abolish slavery, that it would be a breach of good faith, that it would afford just ground of offense to "the South," (meaning the slaveholders) that it would alienate many Unionists from the Union, and make Secessionists of them.

The people, long accustomed to look up to their favorite politicians, and follow their lead, continue to do so. Talk to them of the War-power of the President or of the military Commander to abolish slavery, and they will ask whether the Constitution confers the power. To those who have not studied the ordinary Peace-powers of the Federal Government, it will generally be found of little use to urge the extraordinary War power.

Hence the Constitutional question comes up, again, as fresh as ever.

So does the Bible question, the religious question, the question whether God allows National Governments to exist and exercise authority over men, without protecting the personal rights of all their inhabitants.

Abolitionists, accordingly, find their work still on their hands, as before.

PETITIONS TO CONGRESS.

In the *Principia* for May 25 (Number 80) we published two forms of Petition to the President, a longer and a shorter one, for the abolition of slavery, by Presidential Proclamation—as prepared and recommended by the First Congregational Church in Williamsburgh, the longer of which, duly signed by the Pastor and clerk of the church, had been forwarded to the President.

We have since been requested, by letter, to prepare and publish a form of Petition to Congress, for the same object.

We would suggest that those preferring to petition Con-

gress instead of the President, or in addition thereto, might copy either of those forms, already published, with such alterations as would fit it for being addressed to Congress instead of to the President. Or, referring to those forms for hints and topics of argument, any one could vary the form, at discretion.

In compliance however, with the request sent to us, we will submit an additional form.

PETITION.

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.—We, the undersigned, citizens of ———— respectfully petition that, in the exercise of the legislative authority committed to you by the Constitution of the United States, and in pursuance of its declared objects, (which it is the business of the government to secure), you will defend the "Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to the people of the United States and their posterity," by the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, which is diametrically opposed to those objects. We believe that this measure has been the duty of the Federal Government from the beginning, and that, in the act of declaring its nationality and independence, the nation 'appealed to the Supreme Judge of the world for the rectitude of its intentions' to establish a government "for the security" to "all men" within the nation, of those "rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" which it then declared to be "self-evident." We believe that the Constitution, so far from recognizing the right of the States to maintain slavery, expressly forbade it, by declaring that "No State shall pass any bill of attainder, ex-post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contracts." The right and duty of Congress to abolish slavery, the most anti-republican usage conceivable, we hold to be expressed in that clause of the Constitution which requires that "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union, a republican form of government." We find nothing in the Constitution, when construed by the legal rules of interpretation, that conflicts with these primary declarations and provisions, in the light of which all its minor or doubtful provisions should be construed. We hold, with Madison, that the Constitution, which nowhere mentions slaves, but speaks only of "persons;" contains 'no recognition of the right of property in man.' We hold, with Patrick Henry, that 'Congress has power, under the Constitution, to declare all slaves free.' We insist that the "Constitution of the United States, is the supreme law of the land, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State, to the contrary, notwithstanding." Above all, we insist that no nation has any authority that is not derived from God, and that He never authorized nor commissioned any civil government to exercise authority over men, except under the condition that it should protect the equal rights of all its subjects, all the inhabitants within its geographical boundaries. Neither Nature, Revelation, nor the first principles of civil government, recognize any civil government but such.

These primary truths which have been binding upon us, as a nation, from the beginning, are now being illustrated and forced upon our attention by the disasters which a disregard of them, under the controlling Providence and just moral government of God, are now bringing upon us. The rebellion against the government, is evidently, the natural effect of our neglect to abolish slavery, and is, we doubt not, a divine chastisement for our great national sin in this matter. Our long neglected national duty, has thus become our great, pressing national necessity. Neither Religion, Philosophy nor History, afford us any ground to expect the preservation of our undivided nationality without a speedy compliance with the immutable conditions of national existence and unity, established by the Creator himself, in the nature of things.

That the Federal Government, in the exercise of its war power, has the right, under the laws of nations, to abolish slavery, whatever its limitations of authority in times of peace may have been, we believe to have been incontestably proved by John Quincy Adams, in his memorable speech in Congress, April 14 and 15, 1842, an argument that has never been answered. We petition that, at least, that power may be now exercised.

[N. B.—If a church, in its church capacity, wishes to forward a Petition, the words "citizens of" near the beginning, may be left out, and the name and locality of the church inserted in their place.]

THE "RESULT" OF THE EX-PARTE COUNCIL.

Was it "unanimous?"

We have already stated that Mr. Ira H. Cobb, a delegate from Syracuse, did not consent to the Result of the Ex-parte Council on the Church of the Puritans. The following has since, (June 6) appeared in *The Independent*.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE INDEPENDENT:

In the report of the Ex-parte Council recently invited to hear and act upon questions and matters to be submitted to it by members of the Church of the Puritans, my name appears as one of the delegates. Further on, the report represents the result at which the Council arrived as "unanimously" agreed to and adopted, while the word (unanimously) the printer has repeatedly emphasized by putting it in a change of type. As to the first item it is entirely correct. I entered upon the duties of the commission as instructed by the church which I had the pleasure in part to represent, made the journey to your city, and participated three days in the deliberations, giving them the attention they seemed to demand. But on the fourth day of the Council, finding it impossible for me to act in unison with the views of the brethren with whom I was associated, and indeed seeing my sentiments and conclusions at so great a variance from theirs, I asked the privilege of being excused from the further meetings of the Council, stating my reasons therefor.

Yours, with kind regards, IRA H. COBB.

To this the editors of *The Independent* appended a Note, in which they said:

"We learn from other sources that Mr. Cobb did not arrive in the city until the second day of the session, and that he withdrew before any action was taken by the Council upon the report of the Committee appointed to draft a 'Result.' He therefore did not vote in the negative, nor did he enter a protest against the Result. He simply withdrew, because he felt that he could not agree in the conclusion toward which the discussions in the Council seemed to point. While it is due to this gentleman to publish his statement, we do not see that it has any bearing upon the action of the Council."

We should think that Mr. Cobb's statement had some bearing on the question whether the Result of the Council was "unanimous" on the part of the members, as had been announced.

We have now a Note from Mr. Cobb in which he says—"The council composed of gentlemen from Maine to Illinois was invited to convene on Thursday, at 2 o'clock P.M. At the first session on Friday Mr. C., was in his place, until the Report of the committee appointed to draft the Result had been under discussion for half a day, and when nearly all the members had had the opportunity to express their views upon it."

We have heard it stated that part of the delegation—how many we know not, left for home, two days previous, to any "Result" having been reported, leaving their vote to be recorded for it, whatever it might be, and that several others were not present, at the voting for its adoption.

A very remarkable process of procedure, it must be confessed—especially remarkable, as a foundation for the announcement of an "unanimous Result." If the withdrawal of Mr. Cobb, with an expression of his dissent from the reported "Result" after having heard it read and discussed for half a day, is not to be accounted either as a protest nor yet as a negative vote, we confess we do not see the propriety of recording as having voted in the affirmative, the names of those who neither heard the Report nor the discussions which preceded the vote, or of those who, having heard, did not, in matter of fact, vote at all.

Nevertheless, if the *Independent* insists upon it, we shall not object against holding each member of the Council responsible for its remarkable Document, who does not openly disclaim it.

We have the impression that only a minority, or at most, a small majority of the members of the Council were present at the final vote. The indecent readiness to condemn the Church of the Puritans, at all hazards, is sufficiently apparent, on the face of the whole affair, and the eagerness to trumpet the result as "unanimous" is in perfect keeping with its antecedents.

TIMELY TESTIMONY.

We are happy to give circulation to the following sentiments, extracted from an address to the "Citizens and soldiers of Queens County," N. Y., by Hon. LUTHER C. CARTER, ex-Member of Congress. Having discussed the military affairs of his locality, in connection with the war, he

proceeds to give his views of its origin, and of its legitimate object, as follows:

"Our country has called us to arms, not to defend it against the invasion of any foreign foe, but to defend it from the sacrilegious hands of those of its own children, who seek the destruction of our established government, a government irksome to them, on account of the principle of equal justice, which it extends for the protection of every individual citizen, throughout the length and breadth of the land.

"They have thus become traitors to the National Government—disturbers of the public peace—destroyers of our prosperity at home—and defamers of our national honor, before the people of the whole world.

If you seek for the cause of all this, you will find that it emanates from the spirit of the torries of the Revolution.

They were opposed to the establishment of our free form of Government, which was intended to protect equally, the inherent rights of every human being within its jurisdiction.

The descendants from men of that spirit, are now in arms to destroy that government which their fathers could not prevent from being established.

Shall we not be as true to the spirit of our fathers, as they are to that of theirs?

Their motto now, is to rule or to ruin. Shall they rule, and thus establish a more despotic government than is now acknowledged by civilized man? If not, will you join your loyal brethren throughout the land, to prevent these traitors from destroying the government, and consequently the peace, happiness, and prosperity of the people of the whole nation.

Will you not rally to the defence of the government, and to the overthrow of the reign of terror which now controls the Southern States, and thus establish your loyal brethren of those States, in all the rights which the Constitution guarantees to every citizen of the United States? The loyal people of those States have a right to claim this protection from you; yet, they dare not ask you to come to their aid, for the tongue that should ask would be at once and forever silenced, by the usurped authority of those who now hold control over their several State governments.

Let us urge upon your officers to complete their organizations, and ask that you may be received into the active service of our country; and if this is not done, then let us form an independent company, organize ourselves, and at once offer our services to the government, to assist in its defence and maintenance. To this righteous purpose may we all devote ourselves (in the path which duty may prescribe,) until tyranny and oppression are swept from the land, and our country's flag, (the true emblem of freedom) is once more unfurled to the breeze, in every city and hamlet of our wide-spread land; respected by the people of every State who have sworn allegiance to the Constitution, and have so long been prospered and protected by its wise provisions.

Let us, as one man, be willing to pledge "our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor," to protect the rich blessings of freedom bequeathed to us by our fathers, and to obey their injunctions, by handing down that freedom, untarnished, to our posterity, or die in the attempt, fully relying that, in the discharge of this, our solemn duty, God will be with us, as a wall of defence on every side!

Your obedient servant,
LUTHER C. CARTER.

Hermitage, Flushing, June 3, 1861.

TANEY versus TANEY, AND YET SELF-CONSISTENT.

The *World*, June 7, gives copious extracts from the opinion of Judge Taney in 1843, on the Dorr troubles in Rhode Island, expressing views of the supremacy of the military over the civil power, and the suspension of the Habeas Corpus, in times of rebellion, which are diametrically opposite the doctrine he has recently laid down in the case of Merryman, of Maryland.

We remark that, in one respect, the cases are not exactly parallel. Gov. Dorr and his supporters, three-fourths of the citizens of the State, had committed no rebellion, and would have retained the Government of Rhode Island, but for the interference of Pres. Tyler, at the bidding of the slaveholders, lest the supremacy of the people of the North might furnish a precedent for a supremacy of the people of the South. Whereas the slaveholders have rebelled against the government of the people.

So that Judge Taney might defend himself from the charge of inconsistency, after all. In both cases, he was asserting the supremacy of the aristocracy over the people. In both cases he was doing the will of the slaveholders. The apparent inconsistency is thus reconciled. Calhoun was charged with fitfulness and inconsistency by those who did not understand the one object of his life and labors, the aggrandizement of the slaveholding oligarchy. So with Judge Taney. So with every slaveholding statesman. Well

would it be for the nation, if its non-slaveholding statesmen, were equally self-consistent, far-sighted, and inflexible!

INJUSTICE TO NON-SLAVEHOLDERS OF THE SOUTH.

"It is the slaveholders and not the people who are taking State after State out of the Union, and the time is not far distant when the non-slaveholders of the South, must seek their own preservation, for their personal liberty is destined to follow the loss of their political liberty, though it may be said this they never possessed."

So writes a South-Western Correspondent of the *N. Y. Tribune*. What a comment upon the Lincoln policy, endorsed by the *Tribune*, of courting the slaveholders of the South, instead of the non-slaveholders, by refraining to make war upon slavery! What motive can the non-slaveholders of the South have, more than the slaves, for desiring the success of the Administration or of its troops, if that success is to bring no redemption to them? Real injustice is done to the non-slaveholders, by thus protecting slavery and leaving liberty unprotected!

News of the Day.

Evacuation of Harper's Ferry.—In our last issue we said:

"For weeks past, announcements have been made that our troops were about to attack Harper's Ferry. For weeks, the Rebels there have had leisure to prepare for removing, and the accounts of their preparation have been spread all over the country. All this time our troops have been within a day or two march of them. And now it is 'doubtful' whether they will not be suffered to go unmolested. Can it be a part of Gen. Scott's skillful strategy to let all the Rebel forces concentrate at Manassas Junction, so as to cut them all off at one blow? We should think not."

Scarcely were our forms off the press, and before we had finished mailing our papers, a third edition of the *N. Y. Evening Post*, Friday, June 14th. 4 o'clock. P. M. brought us the following announcements.

Threatening Demonstrations.—*The Movement from Harper's Ferry.*—*Leesburg Occupied in force by the Rebels.*—Washington, June 14.—General Scott has received despatches confirming the reported evacuation of Harper's Ferry, and stating that the rebels left a rear-guard in the town while the main body moved on Leesburg.

This movement threatens an attack on Washington.

SECOND DESPATCH.—Washington, June 14, 3 P. M.—*The sudden movement of the Harper's Ferry rebels is unexpected, and prevents the success of General Scott's movement on Leesburg.*

Advices just received at the War Department render it certain that the rebels are already in possession of Leesburg, with a force of several thousand men.

Leesburg and Fairfax Court House, both important points, are now in undisputed possession of the rebels.

[Leesburg is the capital of Loudon county, Virginia, distant only thirty-eight miles from Alexandria, with which city there is direct communication by the Leesburg and Alexandria railroad. The Federal forces are entrenched near Alexandria, but the upper line of communication is in the hands of the rebels.—*Eds. Evening Post.*]

How could it be said that the retreat from Harper's Ferry was "sudden and unexpected?" In the *Principia* of June 8, copied from our City Dailies of June 5, were "rumors" that the rebels had evacuated Harper's ferry. For a week before that time, and for a week afterwards, there were almost daily statements of travellers who had seen large numbers of waggons collecting and in process of loading up the effects of the rebels, preparatory to removing. Under date of Wednesday, June 11, (as copied into the *Principia* of the 15th,) our city Dailies had the following.

Retreat from Harper's Ferry. According to trustworthy intelligence from Harper's Ferry, the Rebels are retreating. Twelve hundred wagons have been seized from the farmers in the vicinity of Winchester, and are engaged in transporting the troops by detachments to Strasburg, whence they are to go by rail to Manassas Junction. They had received early intelligence of the movement from Washington, and were meeting it in their usual manner. It is doubtful whether our columns will combine in season to make a large capture.

This, be it remembered was June 11th. But on June 14th, the movement was "sudden and unexpected" at Washington!

By subsequent dispatches, as our readers well know, the fact of the evacuation of the rebels from Harper's Ferry has been abundantly confirmed. To the hitherto inexplicable mystery of the long delay to reinforce Fort Sumpter and its final surrender, with an inactive naval force in sight, is now to be added the equally inexplicable mystery of the delay to capture Harper's Ferry, or, at least prevent the retreating rebels from concentrating their forces elsewhere. The delinquency, somewhere, is too evident for dispute. Whether it was a military delinquency, or a political manoeuvre, preparatory to compromise and pacification, the people have a right to inquire, and to be informed. That the danger of compromise is not past we have the testimony of the *Tribune*.

The Impending Compromise.—The great peril of the Republic, now imminent, is not so much a feeble, aimless, ineffective prosecution of the war for the Union, as a premature and shameful peace, which shall render all the perils and sacrifices already incurred of no avail. We are assured that already secret agents of the traitors are in Washington and this city, trying to ensnare leading Democrats into back-stairs arrangements for putting an end to the struggle, by some muddle that can be called a compromise. They profess to desire a formal separation and a recognition of the independence of the rebel Confederacy; but, they know this will not be entertained, they hint that perhaps a reconstruction which involved a full guaranty of "the rights of the South" might not prove inadmissible. In some quarters, it is vaguely given out that the Crittenden proposition guaranteeing the existence of slavery in all present and future territory south of 36° 30', would not be rejected without careful consideration. And from another quarter we hear that President Davis would be very happy to accommodate President Lincoln with an armistice, sixty or ninety days, to afford time for negotiations!—*The Tribune*.

We wish we could believe that none but Democrats were disposed to compromise. In this city, as we hear, from various parts of the Free States, the Democrats are less disposed, than the Republicans, to compromise, and are more ready to avow the conviction that a national abolition of slavery is the only means of deliverance. Up to this hour, we know of but one Republican paper, and that in the remote West, that has objected to that most fatal of all the proposed compromises, the one, recommended by President Buchanan, assented to by Messrs Seward and Lincoln, and recommended to the States by the Senate and House of Representatives, namely an unamendable amendment of the Constitution for perpetuating Slavery in the States under the protection of the Federal Government, not repudiating the duty to make war against "every attribute of the Almighty" (as Jefferson said) to put down an insurrection of slaves! That proposed "compromise" received the assent of the *Tribune*, and to this day, its position remains unchanged.—This fact, in its connection with the mystery of Harper's ferry and "the impending Compromise" belongs to "the News of the Day." The reading of news items, the year round, without putting them together, and reflecting upon them, may leave the reader almost or quite as ignorant, as if he had never read a paragraph.

SATURDAY, 15th.

Washington, Friday, June 15.—The Government finds itself seriously embarrassed in the management of the present military campaign, by the premature publication of sufficient information to disclose its purposes to the public South, as well as the North. Portions of its plans for the movements of the troops have thus been made known, and has enabled the rebels to frustrate the successful execution of them. This it is no longer disposed to allow to be done, and yet it is unwilling to exclude the Press from the advantages afforded by the telegraph, and therefore is reluctantly about to prohibit the transmission of dispatches for publication.

In view of this state of things, it is suggested that editors of the leading journals in Philadelphia, New-York, Boston, and other cities, immediately meet at Washington and come to some satisfactory understanding, which will relieve the Government from further embarrassment, and yet afford the Press all the facilities it can reasonably desire under the circumstances.

MONDAY, 17th.

Newspapers in New Orleans are said to be in danger of discontinuance for want of printing paper, for which they are mainly dependent on the Free States, and paper has been recently declared "contraband"—a shrewd measure of our Government, no doubt.—It strikes us, however, that blank printing paper is not one tenth part as effective for

the support of the Southern Rebellion, as the same sheets of paper, printed over with Biblical, Constitutional, and political arguments in favor of slavery, compromise, non-intervention, State rights, conservative preaching, church fellowship with slaveholders, and ex-parte Council bulls against the Church of the Puritans. We don't ask that these shall be declared contraband. We believe in freedom of the press, and should be sorry to get no Southern news-papers. Yet we candidly believe that if there had been no Northern pro-slavery and dough face literature, there would have been no Southern Rebellion.

General Lee's movements.—General Lee (formerly General Scott's favorite aid, now a prominent commander in the rebel force,) was at Manassas Junction on Thursday. He was received with great pomp and circumstance, reviewed the army and made an encouraging address to them. He predicts a short contest, but a bloody one.—What portion of the Confederate troops are under his command is not known, but it is thought that he will soon take charge at Manassas, subordinate only to Beauregard. Gen. Lee, who was a great favorite here, was looking well, and created a great sensation upon parade.

Death of Count Cavour.—By the Jura we have the painful intelligence of the death of Count Cavour, who died on the 6th.

The event has caused a profound sensation in Europe. On the evening preceding his death his state became so alarming that great emotion was evinced by the people. At Turin immense crowds surrounded his residence.

Peril by Poison.—Should the Federal troops capture Memphis, in addition to the venomous editorials of the Journals of that city, they are threatened with a swarm of new dangers. The *Bulletin* says that they (the Confederates,) "can furnish deserters with the yellow fever within twenty days; they might poison their cisterns and put their enemies upon river water, and in less than a week our troops would have small alligators crawling through them; cholera would furnish an elysium compared with the delights of a vertical sun, and the turbid waters of the Father of Floods."

No time should be lost in organizing a regiment of toxicologists to guard our troops from these new hazards.

Washington, June 15.—The Federal troops are throwing up new entrenchments northwest of the city on the Virginia side of the Potomac.

The government is taking every precaution to ensure the safety of the capital and to prevent the rebels from crossing the Potomac, at any point above the city.

Arrangements will be complete in a day or two to prevent publication of intelligence of important movements of our troops, especially the movements having reference to the rebels.—*Evening Post.*

Virginia. We have intelligence this morning that Virginia has been entered by two additional columns of Federal troops—at Leesburgh by Col. Stone, with the New-York Ninth as his advance guard, and at a point opposite Williamsport, Md., by the advance guard of Gen. Patterson's army, under Gen. Caldwell. With regard to the movement on Leesburgh, we have not yet received the particulars; but at Williamsport, we learn, our troops waded the Potomac, waist deep, covered by a sufficient force of artillery. There have been no movements of importance in the vicinity of Washington.

There appears to be no doubt that the great body of the fourteen thousand rebel troops, which recently occupied Harper's Ferry, has proceeded to reinforce Gens. Beauregard and Lee at Manassas Junction, but it is stated, on the authority of a person who was at the Ferry on Saturday night, that a portion of them was expected to proceed to Romney, to join the command of Henry A. Wise, the crazy Ex Governor of Virginia, who is reported to be on his march from Staunton with three thousand men, to oppose the progress of Gen. McClellan's forces.—*Times.*

Later advice from Fortress Monroe, dated Saturday evening, make no mention of any new movement of troops against the enemy, as announced in previous dispatches. Col. Max Weber's German Regiment, which left this City on board the *Alabama*, had arrived, and had gone into camp near Hampton. The fifteen additional regiment called for by Gen. Butler are expected to be soon on the ground, and among them will be a corps of artillery from Fort McHenry, and a regiment of mounted rifles, which latter are needed to operate against the Virginia light cavalry. The troops will soon extend their lines further into the country, and the whole peninsula between the James and York Rivers will be made an intrenched camp, connected with the Fortress by telegraph wires.—*Id.*

Missouri. The probability of a collision between the State and Federal troops in Missouri is hourly increasing. In fact, it is reported that a skirmish has already taken place near Independence, in which the Federal troops were worsted. The report, however, cannot be relied upon, as the lines of telegraph in that region are entirely in the hands of the Secessionists. All the counties on both sides of the Missouri River, from the Kansas border to Boonville, are reported to be under their sway, and at the latter place they are intrenching themselves. Meanwhile, troops are being assembled on the Missouri border, ready to be marched within he confines whenever their services may be required, which will probably be very soon.

Eight Illinois regiments are to be stationed within two hours' march of St. Louis, four at Belleville, and four at Caseyville.

Quincy, Ill., Sunday, June 16. I learn from a messenger from St. Josephs, Mo., last evening, that Col. Curtis' Regiment of Iowa Volunteers had made their head-quarters at St. Josephs, Mo. His forces have been distributed over one hundred miles of the Hannibal and St. Josephs Railroad.

Col. Bates' First Regiment is distributed along the same road. He has taken the locomotives from the North Missouri road, to prevent their falling into the hands of the rebels.

There are no troops at Hannibal. About 100 are stationed at the bridge near Palmyra.

Fears entertained there of an attack.

Last night, some of Col. Curtis' force had a difficulty at the Station, 20 miles east of St. Josephs.

The agent's son had some words with one of the soldiers. He drew a pistol, declaring that he would have no sauce from an Abolitionist soldier. The soldier immediately shot him dead.

Jefferson City, the Capital of Missouri, was taken possession of, on Saturday, by the loyal troops under Gen. Lyon. The traitor, Gov. Jackson, is supposed to be intrenched at Boonville.—*World.*

The Rebels approaching Washington.—Two regiments of the rebels arrived at Fairfax to-day, from Manassas Junction. There is no doubt of this.

Reliable information was received to-day at Alexandria, fully confirming the rumors of the reinforcement of Fairfax Court House, by the rebels from Manassas Junction, and indicating, from every point, offensive rather than defensive movements on their part. In the meanwhile there need be no fears that the government is idle. The most extensive and complete arrangements have been made.—*Id.*

Troops from the South.—A citizen of Washington who has just arrived from Columbia, South Carolina, where he has been at work in the State House, says that the cars coming North, were full of troops en route for Virginia. He states that the general opinion is, that the bulk of the campaign will be confined to Virginia.—*Id.*

The Herald of the same day, presents the opposite side of the picture, thus,

The Secessionists outwitted in their designs on the Capital.—From reports current here to-day, it is the choice of one of the horns of the dilemma mentioned in my dispatches last night, as regards the rebels. Finding Edward's Ferry effectually guarded by the federal troops advancing to all the crossings of the Potomac, towards the rear of Washington, and a ten mile battery of guns of heavy calibre frowning upon them in front, they seem to have abandoned all idea of an attack. It would be folly for them to attempt to make a stand at Manassas, and the whole force, except a rear guard at the Junction, are said to be already retiring toward Richmond.

This continued retrograde movement is dispiriting and demoralizing to the rebels and their sympathizers, and gives encouragement to the Union men, everywhere, in the South.

From the West.—Advices reached General Scott last night that an attack on Cairo by General Pillow, with some 20,000 men, was threatened to take place on to-morrow, the 18th inst., but that General Prentiss felt perfectly prepared to resist him, should he make the attempt. General Pillow, it appears, had been promised aid from Kentucky and Missouri, by Governors Jackson and Magoffin; but the recent activity of the federal forces in those states is very likely to prevent any assistance being given from that quarter.—*Herald.*

Interesting from Alexandria.—*Alexandria June 16, 1861.* A reconnaissance of the Loudon and Hampshire Railroad was made to-day, two miles beyond Vienna, which is fifteen miles north of Alexandria, the train being under charge of Colonel Powers, accompanied by the First regiment of Connecticut troops under the command of Brigadier General Tyler. It was reported that the fourth bridge but recently constructed, was burnt last night, but all the bridges were found safe, and the train returned. When two miles this side of Nima, a man in ambush fired on the train, wounding George Busbee of the Connecticut Life Guard. General Tyler was standing by the side of the wounded man on an open car. The shot was evidently intended for him. The train was stopped as soon as possible, and the companies were divided to scour the woods, and search the neighboring farm houses, &c., to make a circuit of a mile.—*Id.*

The appointment of civilians to military positions.—Gen. Scott is reported to have said that he will not be Commander in-Chief of the Army, if civilians continue to be appointed over the heads of Lieutenants in the regular army. The list of newly appointed officers in the additional regular regiments will be published early this week. J. M. B. Potter, of Rhode Island, has been appointed Paymaster of the army.

The force at Washington.—After Gen. Patterson's arrival, the force here, augmented by several regiments now en route, cannot be less than 75,000, and may be, if Gen. McClellan be directed to push forward his column, not far from 100,000.

The force at Fortress Monroe.—A week hence Gen. Butler may have 20,000 at Old Point Comfort and Newport News.—*Id.*

The President's Message to Congress, now soon to meet, is approaching completion. It will take strong ground in favor of the most energetic measures, in order that the war may be closed by the next winter. Half a million men, and two hundred millions of money are spoken of as likely to be raised.—*Id.*

Hagerstown, Md., June 16, 1861.—Information, which is deemed trustworthy, has been received here, that the Secessionists had abandoned Leesburg yesterday, after burning all cars and locomotives on the railroad terminating there.

Kentucky.—PROVISIONS GOING SOUTHWARD.—Louisville, June 16.—Considerable quantities of provisions have been received here during the past three days, mostly from Madison, Indiana, which have gone, and are going South, via. the Nashville Railroad.

A Slave, the Nightingale, was brought into New York on Saturday last, having been captured with 950 slaves on board, off the coast of Africa, by the frigate *Saratoga*.—*World.*

TUESDAY, 18th.

The morning papers are, as usual, occupied with vague and contradictory rumors, some of them favorable, others of them unfavorable to the success of the Federal arms. The Washington Correspondent of the Tribune makes Gen. Scott pleased with the sudden evacuation of Harper's Ferry, (which former accounts said had disappointed his plans)—records another alarm of an apprehended attack upon Washington, makes the number of rebel troops at Norfolk, "not over 4,500" then puts them down by another informant, at 20,000, instead of the 2,000 lately reported! In an editorial summary of the "latest war news," the Tribune tells us that 22,000 rebel troops are at Manassas Junction, speaks of "retreating rebels at Fairfax Court House, joined by re-inforcements from Manassas Junction, fearing to retreat further lest all their men should desert." On referring to the map, we find Fairfax Court House nearly half way from Manassas Junction toward Washington, a course of "retreat" not quite intelligible to us. Col. Stone's column from Washington, is said to be in quiet possession of Leesburg, which is between Harper's Ferry and Manassas Junction, just in time not to interrupt the march of the rebels from Harper's Ferry to Manassas Junction, to join the main army. On one point, the Tribune is quite clear and intelligible, namely:

RETURN OF A FUGITIVE SLAVE.—John Little of Washington, found a missing slave in an Ohio camp, who was returned to him by the Colonel and committed to jail. It is to be presumed that Little is loyal. The disposition of these cases is left to the discretion of the commanding officers, who usually bear in mind the general distinction between friends and enemies. The Administration has come to no conclusion in the matter, contrary to that contained in Secretary Cameron's excellent letter to Gen. Butler, published some weeks ago. The journals which assert that Gen. Butler has been directed to receive no more contraband, are misinformed.

Taking up the Times, we learn that the whereabouts of Col. Stone is uncertain. He may be at Leesburg, or still at Edward's Ferry, or perhaps east of the Potomac.

Advices from Fort Monroe are to Sunday evening. It is evident that the rebels are landing in considerable force, at a point some seven miles above Newport News, on the same side of the river, and an attack from that quarter is looked for daily.

MISSOURI.—According to the Times, the State Government of Missouri is pretty nearly disbanded—the Governor and other State officers turned rebels, and flying before the Federal troops, the Lieut. Governor absent in Arkansas, with the rebels. The Times says the Missouri State Convention, that voted against Secession, has not disbanded, and suggests that there is now an opportunity for it to organize a Provisional Government.

LOYALTY IN EAST TENNESSEE.—In East Tennessee, as in Western Virginia, says the Times, there is a large majority for the Union. Very likely; but why? Because in East Tennessee and in Western Virginia there is, and all along has been, a good deal of Anti-slavery. The desire for the abolition of slavery is the secret of fidelity to the Union. So also in Missouri, in Kentucky, in North Carolina, and in Maryland, the proportionate amount of loyalty, is just about the same as of anti-slavery.

What a comment upon the Federal policy commended by the Tribune, of totally ignoring the anti-slavery issue and element, in the war. So far from gaining friends in the border States, by this policy of courting the bogus slaveholding Unionists, the Government is only cooling and disgusting its real

friends. We are not speaking unintelligently. We claim to know more of the anti-slavery of the border States, than the President, Cabinet, and Editorial staff of the Tribune combined. We have been in a position, for more than a quarter of a century, as they have not, of knowing who and what the loyal men, in other words, the anti-slavery men, of those States are, and what they are desiring at the hands of the people of the Free States, and of the National Government. We are satisfied that a National Proclamation of abolition would strengthen the Government in the border States, not only by unmasking its false friends but by invigorating its only true ones.

WASHINGTON, JUNE 19.

Repulse at Vienna, (Va.) Gen. Schenck left Alexandria, Monday afternoon, with the 1st Regiment of Ohio Volunteers, Col. McCook, intending to guard the road between that place and Vienna, a town about four miles from Fairfax Court House. He dropped several companies at points along the road, and proceeded with about 275 men toward Vienna. When within half a mile of that place a masked battery of three guns opened upon the train with a sudden and severe cannonade, using shells, round shot and grape. The number of the killed and wounded was seven of the former and four of the latter.

The locomotive was disabled by a shot, and could not draw the train out of the fire; therefore the troops left the cars and betook themselves to the woods on the right and left of the track. Then the engineer detached his engine from the train and went as rapidly as possible back to Alexandria, leaving the troops on their feet. This deprived them of all means of transporting their wounded except by the use of hand litters, and upon these and in blankets the sufferers were carried.

It was found that the Rebel batteries were sustained by infantry and cavalry, 1,500 strong, and the Ohio troops retired about five miles to the Telegraphic Camp. Early yesterday morning the 1st and 2d Connecticut Regiments and the 69th New-York went to the relief of the Ohio man, and several other regiments were ordered to be in readiness to move at a moment's notice, it being probable that an attack was to be made at once by the National troops on Fairfax Court-House, where there are, as it is supposed, about 4,000 Rebels. It is reported that a large force has gone to occupy Vienna.

A singular and striking feature of this affair is the fact that Gen. Schenck was proceeding through an enemy's country, weakening his force by frequently detaching companies along the road, and yet that he had no skirmishers out, nor were any means except the most ordinary taken to guard against surprise. One might suppose that the experiences at Great Bethel, the other day, would have taught a salutary lesson touching this, even if the foresight of the commanding officer had not been sufficient to have prevented such a mistake.

It is believed, according to our latest dispatches, that the forces which attacked the train of cars have retired, carrying with them their battery, and that Vienna has been peaceably occupied by the National troops, who are advancing toward, if they have not already reached Fairfax Court-House.—*Tribune*.

The War in Missouri. We have startling intelligence from Missouri. An extra of the St. Louis Democrat, published yesterday, announces that an engagement had taken place at Booneville, between Gen. Lyon's forces and the rebel forces there, in which the latter were totally routed, with a loss of three hundred killed and six hundred taken prisoners, while the Federal loss was but seventeen. Ex-Gov. Sterling Price, commanding the rebels, is reported to be mortally wounded. There is some doubt in St. Louis as to the reliability of the report of the engagement, but a dispatch received previously announced that cannonading had been heard in the direction of Booneville. Former advices indicated that Gen. Lyon, the commander of the Federal forces, was in hot pursuit of the traitor Governor, with a strong likelihood that he will overtake him, probably at Booneville, where Jackson was endeavoring to concentrate all his available force, though he does not appear to have been there in person. On Sunday morning last he had two thousand men there, with about a thousand more on the opposite side of the river, and cannon had been planted upon elevated ground commanding the approaches. Capt.

Montgomery, of Kansas, is reported to be on the Missouri border with a large body of horse, ready to meet Jackson should he attempt to escape in that direction. The chances appear to be rather against the traitor Governor.—*Times*.

Skirmish at Conrad's Ferry. A skirmish at "long range," across the Potomac took place on Monday, between a portion of Col. Stone's command at Conrad's Ferry, and a body of rebels on the other side. The enemy brought up three or four six-pounders, with which they fired a number of rounds, but did not succeed in doing any damage. The fire was returned by some twenty picked marksmen, with rifled muskets, but the distance was so great that only one of the gunners was brought down. The enemy opposite Conrad's is supposed to be about 300 strong, while they have about a hundred cavalry near the mouth of Seneca Creek, where intrenchments have been thrown up to command the roads to Leesburgh and Drainsville.—*Times*.

The Balloon reconnaissance.—This afternoon the long promised balloon ascension for military purposes took place. The elevation attained was not very great, though it was perfectly satisfactory as an experiment. The aeronauts were Prof. Lowe, Gen. Burns, of the Telegraph Company, and H. C. Robinson, operator. The balloon was connected with the War Department by telegraph. The first message ever telegraphed from a balloon was then sent to the President of the United States, by Professor Lowe.—*World*.

THURSDAY, 20th.

The battle at Booneville. The latest accounts confirm the previous ones, concerning the battle at Boonesville, Mo., in all the leading particulars, except that no mention is made of the taking of prisoners—the enemy having escaped by flight.

Gen. Price was not killed, but disabled by sudden illness.

Eastern Virginia. Col. Stone and his command still remain at Poolesville, on this side of the Potomac. There had been some slight skirmishing at Goose Creek, and the rebels were dispersed. By some accounts it is affirmed, and by others denied, that the rebels still hold possession of Leesburg.

Vicinity of the Capital. The *Herald* quotes the *Washington Star* as representing that the rebel forces at Manassas Junction and elsewhere, are "moving forward by daily instalments to points nearer the Federal lines," and toward Washington. The *Tribune* correspondent, on the other hand, represents the rebels as preparing to fall back, and retreat to Richmond.

New York Troops. All the New-York troops in readiness are ordered immediately to Washington.

Rumor. A special dispatch from Grafton to the *Cincinnati Gazette*, says the rebels occupy Piedmont, Va., three or four thousand strong—also that a skirmish had taken place, in which "the rebels suffered terribly."

Fugitive slaves sent adrift.—A number of runaway slaves made their appearance in the Ohio encampment in the course of the day. General Schenck gave directions not to tolerate them among the troops. This will prove to be a mistake. No means will be taken to return them to their owners.—*Herald*.

The Wheeling Convention have organized a loyal State Government for Virginia, by a vote of 73 to 3, and have nominated FRANK PIERPONT of Marion, for Governor.

Slaves in the Rebel Army.—It is positively stated by persons in the vicinity of the rebel batteries at Vienna, that the South Carolina troops placed in front of themselves, one hundred and fifty negroes to receive the fire of the Ohio men, but that the former fell flat on their faces when the muskets of the latter were pointed in their direction, and that thus the shot passed over them, and killed six of the soldiers whom they were set up to protect.

Western Virginia.—Another collision is expected at Philippi, in the neighborhood of which the rebels are said to be 1,500 strong; also at Romney, where there are said to be four thousand. The Federal troops are being rapidly re-inforced to meet them.

Vienna.—The ground lately occupied by the rebel battery, near Vienna, is now held by Federal troops. Leesburg is still held by the rebels.

The Free Negro Sailors at New Orleans.—A few days since we noted the fact that eight free negro sailors had been seized at New Orleans, and were held subject to the orders of the Confederate authorities. The New Orleans *Bee* of the 5th instant announced the following disposition of the case:

"The negro sailors taken on the prizes Panania and John Adams, were delivered into the custody of Recorder Blache, the C. S. Marshal, Mr. Beverly declining to have anything to do with them. Our readers will recollect the Recorder's telegraphic inquiry for instructions from Attorney-General Benjamin. Yesterday he received the following telegram in answer:

"RICHMOND, June 3, 1861.

"Hon. Anatole Blache, Recorder of the Second District, New-Orleans, Louisiana:

"The free negroes are not held as prisoners under the law of the Confederates States. Dispose of them according to the laws of the state.

J. P. BENJAMIN,

"Attorney-General, C. S. A."

"We suppose that these men will be discharged from custody, with a warning to leave the South forthwith."—*Evening Post*.

Family Miscellany.

THE BELLE OF THE BALL.

BY WINTHROP MACWORTH FRANK:

Years—years ago—ere yet my dreams
Had been of being wise and witty;
Ere I had done with writing themes,
Or yawned o'er this infernal Chitty;
Years, years ago, while all my joy
Was in my fowling-piece and filly;
In short, while I was yet a boy,
I fell in love with Laura Lily.

I saw her at a country ball;
There when the sound of flute and fiddle
Gave signal sweet, in that old hall,
Of hands across, and down the middle,
Her's was the subtlest spell by far
Of all that sets young hearts romancing;
She was our queen, our rose, our star;
And when she danced—O heaven, her dancing!

Dark was her hair, her hand was white!
Her voice was exquisitely tender,
Her eyes were full of liquid light!
I never saw a waist so slender!
Her every look, her every smile,
Shot right and left a score of arrows;
I thought 'twas Venus from her isle;
I wandered where she'd left her sparrows.

She talked of politics or prayers;
Of Southey's prose, or Wordsworth's sonnets;
Of daggers or of dancing-bears,
Of battles, or the last new bonnets;
By candle-light, at twelve o'clock.
To me it mattered not a little,
If those bright lips had quoted Locke,
I might have thought they murmured Little.

Through sunny May, through sultry June,
I loved her with a love eternal;
I spoke her praises to the moon,
I wrote them for the Sunday Journal.
My mother laughed: "I soon found out
That ancient ladies have no feeling;
My father frowned; but how should gout
Find any happiness in kneeling?"

She was the daughter of a dean,
Rich, fat, and rather apoplectic;
She had one brother, just thirteen,
Whose color was extremely hectic;
Her grandmother, for many a year,
Had fed the parish with her bounty;
Her second-cousin was a peer,
And lord-lieutenant of the county.

But titles and the three-per-cent,
And mortgages, and great relations,
And India bonds, and tithes and rents,
Oh! what are they to love's sensations?
Black eyes, fair forehead, clustering locks,
Such wealth, such honors, Cupid chooses;
He cares as little for the stocks,
As Baron Rothschild for the muses.

She sketched: the vale, the wood, the beach,
Grew lovelier from her pencil's shading.
She botanized: I envied each
Young blossom in her boudoir fading.
She warbled Handel: it was grand—
She made the Catalinas jealous;
She touched the organ: I could stand
For hours and hours and blow the bellows.

She kept an album, too, at home,
Well fill'd with all an album's glories:
Paintings of butterflies and Rome,
Patterns for trimmings, Persian stories;
Soft songs to Julia's cockatoo,
Fierce odes to famine and to slaughter;
And autographs of Prince Leboo,
And recipes of elder-water.

And she was flattered, worshipped, bored:
Her steps were watched, her dress was noted,
Her poodle-dog was quite adored,
Her sayings were extremely quoted.

She laughed, and every heart was glad,
As if the taxes were abolished,
She frowned, and every look was sad,
As if the opera were demolished.
She smiled on many just for fun—
I know that there was nothing in it;
I was the first, the only one
Her heart had thought of, for a minute:
I knew it, for she told me so,
In phrase which was divinely moulded;
She wrote a charming hand, and oh!
How sweetly all her notes were folded!

Our love was like most other loves—
A little glow, a little shiver;
A rosebud and a pair of gloves.
And 'Fly Not Yet,' upon the river;
Some jealousy of some one's heir,
Some hopes of dying broken-hearted,
A miniature, a lock of hair,
The usual vows—and then we parted.
We parted; months and years rolled by:
We met again, four summers after;
Our parting was all sob and sigh—
Our meeting was all mirth and laughter;
For in my heart's most secret cell,
There had been many other lodgers;
And she was not the ball-room belle,
But only Mrs.—Something—Rogers.

THE SLAVE-TRADE.

The young readers of the *Christian Press* have often heard of the "Slave-Trade," and perhaps they have heard some things about it which were written for older readers. I have thought you might wish a letter, telling something about this trade, which your friends and parents think so wicked.

Can you find Egypt, and Greece, and Rome, on your map? Do you know what the people were called, who lived in these countries? If you read history you often see their names. They are Egyptians, Grecians, and Romans. Many, many years ago, all of these people, and some others bought and sold men, and women and children. If a poor man owed a rich one money, and could not pay, the rich man would seize the poor man and sell him, just as he would a horse. Parents sold their own children. Sometimes there was a sad reason for this. When there was a famine in the land, and they could get food in no other way the little children were sold for money or bread.

Do you not think your mother would starve before she would sell you?

You have often been told that one bad thing leads to another. This is very true. The people of whom we have spoken, often fought with other people. They killed some and made slaves of the rest.

These slaves were not always black; white men were also made slaves. But the negroes were so patient and mild, and could work so hard, and so long, that the Romans bought them whenever they could.

You have never seen an Arab, I suppose. He looks something like an Indian; his skin is not so white as yours. If one of them came into your house you might be afraid of him; he wears a kind of cap very different from yours. It is called a turban. He has no coat such as your father wears, but something that looks partly like a coat and partly like a dress. He often carries a pistol, or sword, or gun, or all of these. He looks like a warrior, and if you saw him coming, I think you would hide in the closet or run to one of your parents.

These people began to buy and sell negroes who lived in Africa near their home in Arabia. But they did not steal them. Wicked men in Europe did this. A little more than four hundred years ago, people in Europe knew very little of Africa, but about that time a sea captain from Portugal, whose name was Antonio Gonzales, landed on the western coast. He carried away with him some negro boys, and sold them in Spain. Then other captains of ships carried away boys and girls, and at last they went there on purpose for negroes, just as they had been for gold, and ivory, and gum.

Those who lived where the ships landed were pleased with the beads, and knives, and bright cloths, which the captain brought. So they would always have some poor boys or girls ready to sell for these things when the ship came. It was thus that the slave-trade began. Seventy

years from the time that Antonio Gonzales carried the boys from Guinea to Spain, thousands were carried away every year.

You have heard and read the story of Joseph, who was sold as a slave into Egypt. How sorry you have felt for his poor father, who thought him killed by some wild beast! How wicked it was for his brothers to put him into a pit, and then when they saw the Ishmaelites coming, to take him out and sell him! How hard it was for that good boy to be a prisoner! All this, and much more, makes a sad story. But a great many sad things of this kind have happened in the same country where Joseph was a slave. Yet while he was sorrowful he was happy too, because he was good, and he knew God would take care of him. But many a boy has been sold in Africa, who has had no such happiness as Joseph had, because he knew nothing of Joseph's God, and had none of the peace and joy which he alone can give. I would rather be a slave, with Jesus Christ for my friend, than to be the richest man in the world, or to be the greatest king of earth, without a knowledge of Him.—*Christian Press*.

From The Sandwich Gazette.

INTELLECTUAL HABITS.

Let us, for a moment, contemplate the man who, to diligent attention to business unites liberal tastes and good intellectual habits. Not content with comforts and luxuries for the body, he has provided society for the mind. He has assembled few at least, perhaps many of the master spirits of ancient and modern times, and domesticated them in his apartments. For their sake he is content to retire from the circle of idlers, to pass by the lounge in the coffee room, to leave unopened the last novel and the last review. He loves their society; and without neglecting any duty, any call of business, he always returns to them with pleasure, and while conversing with them his spirits are calmed, his weariness subsided and his cares cease to annoy him. Always occupied with some interesting subject, or great work, he is never, for a moment, at a loss how to spend a vacant hour. Not satisfied with one perusal of an author, or one examination of a subject, he reviews, compares different authors, and conflicting statements, searches for objections, keeps his judgment in suspense, and is anxious only to know the truth. Passing as he does from grave to gay, from lively to severe, from dulce to utile, he is never weary, his mind is always fresh, always buoyant. After a few moments reading in the morning, more or less as he has time, he carries out in the world a striking thought, an interesting subject, or perhaps a volume which may occupy his mind in vacant intervals, during the day. Having a relish for the productions of the fine arts, and especially for the beauties of nature, his journeys gratify his taste; while his table attracts the intelligent, gives him the society of thinking men, and his substance, instead of being employed to surround him with vulgar splendor, decorates his abode with a simple but elegant taste, or contributes to the well being of others. He needs no high excitement. Petty irritations and little passions pass by him as the idle wind. Every day improves his taste, his judgment, his imaginations. His reasoning powers are invigorated, while his mind is filled with great principles, with sound maxims, with beautiful images. Every evening he is soothed and surely encouraged by the consciousness of having made some acquisition, during the day, of having enjoyed a refined pleasure, and contemplated for the first time a noble and important truth.

What a contrast to such a character is the mere man of business, who possesses no taste for reading, or who, reading at random masters no subject, acquires no accurate information, no vigorous logical habits, no liberal tastes; who is compelled to spend the intervals of business in dull vacuity, in frivolous conversation, or in gross sensual indulgence; who lavishes his substance to invest himself with a vulgar splendor; and seek that excitement so necessary to men void of intellectual tastes, in politics or in mad speculation.

I. V.

On Saturday week, a young lady stated in the hearing of a Boston merchant, that if she had a piece of flannel, she would make it up for the soldiers. She was taken at her word, and a large piece was sent to her house. In three days it was returned to the donor, in army pattern. Each

shirt had an ample pocket, stocked with bandages, fibrilia lint, a pocket handkerchief, a box of Russia salve, and a pin case.

A virtual conscription is now common at New Orleans. A Yankee, who was driven into forced enlistment there, has written home: "Tell the boys we shall aim high, and fire blank cartridges!"

Whatever is hard in religion, is made so by our want of heart, our want of love, our want of confidence; and is, therefore, not Christ's yoke, at all. It is not true religion, it is not Christian liberty, but legal bondage.

Riches may enable us to confer favors, but riches cannot give us the power to confer them with propriety and grace. Even trifles may be so bestowed as to cease to be trifles.

CURE FOR CROUP.—When the symptoms appear, immediately fold a towel, dip it in cold water, and apply it to the child's breast and throat; then wrap a blanket closely around him.

Or, bathe the feet well in warm water, at the same time rubbing the throat and breast with mutton tallow or goose grease, then envelop in a warm blanket. Either of these modes will check the disease till the arrival of a physician, and in many cases will themselves effect a cure.

To rub common hard soap well into the threads of stockings before putting them on, for a long march, is recommended as a preventive to the ordinary foot soreness and blistering which occur to those not used to traveling.

QUAKER'S QUERY.—"Obadiah," said a venerable elder to his grandson, "these knows it is against the discipline of the Society of Friends to fight." "Yes, grandfather." "Is that shooting thing in thy hands rifled?" "Of course it is; you don't think I would have any other?" "I am told that is the best kind; now thee must take it right out of thy grandfather's sight."

"The right man in the right place," a husband at home in the evening.

Aye! But what if he can't find his family at home, in the evening, when he gets there?

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL

For sale at the office of the *Principia*: FOR CASH ONLY.
DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols., \$1 50..... Postage 32 cts.
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol., \$1 00 Postage 32 c.
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol., \$0 50..... Postage 16 c.

OUR NATIONAL CHARTERS.

FO THE MILLIONS, INCLUDING

I. The Federal Constitution of 1787-9.
II. The Articles of Confederation, 1778.
III. The Declaration of Independence, 1776.
IV. The Articles of Association, 1774.
With notes showing their bearing on slavery, and the relative powers of the State and National Governments. Also a summary of *Legal Rules of Interpretation and Legal opinions* collected from the highest authorities, is prefixed to the Constitution. AN APPENDIX contains extracts from State Constitutions and Bills of Rights—Ordinance of 1787, excluding slavery from the Northwest Territory; also, sentiments of the Revolutionary fathers, &c.

PRICES OF "Our National Charters."
By mail, postage prepaid, by the Publisher.
Single copy 15 cents.
For 4 copies 50 "
9 " 1.00
12 " 1.30
20 " 2.00
31 " 3.00
In packages of more than 20 or 30 copies it is generally cheaper to send by Express, (where it can be done) than by Mail. But this may depend on the distance and directness of the route, and may be ascertained by experiment, or by inquiry at the nearest Express depot.
Delivered at the Office; or sent by private conveyance, or express, as ordered, at the expense of the purchaser.
Single copy 12 cts.
For 4 copies 38 "
9 " 75 "
13 " 1.00
20 " 1.50
28 " 2.00
46 " 3.00
100 " 6.00

For sale by WILLIAM GOODELL, or M. B. WILLIAMS, Office of the *Principia*, 339 Pearl Street, New York. TERMS, CASH, always advance.

N.B. All postages on Books, Pamphlets, and Tracts, must be paid at our Post-Office in advance, so that we cannot answer orders as above, without having received the postage money, as well as the price of the publications.

Also, for sale as above,
Spooner's Unconstitutionality of Slavery,
In paper covers, price 75 cents, postage 13 cts.; in cloth, \$1.60 postage 19c.
We have no books, pamphlets, or tracts for sale, except those advertised, above, and it is not convenient for us to receive orders for any others.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 104 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK